

8. The argument concerning claim 1 has noted. The rejection of this claim is maintained because at column 7 lines 30-33 the portable touch screen display is described as maintaining the menu driven interface when the host computer runs programs too large for the portable touch screen display to handle. In this mode of operation the display provides responses to the user in response to "positional data representative of a current location of the positional input device". This is the typical response that a menu based program provides to the user. An example of visual responses to positional device locations is present in windowing programs. Such programs were in existence prior to the time of applicants invention. Responses to positional device locations is described in the previously cited Scientific American article. The portable touch screen display would also send the positional data over the wireless link to the host computer to be used by the program running on the host computer. The wireless transmission of positional data is the type of fundamental technical information that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention would know is necessary to perform their programmed functions. Furthermore one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to accomplish the transmission of the positional data from basic communication technology. A reference to show such a transmission is not necessary and is inherent in the reference itself. The transmission of data necessary to perform programmed functions is described in the previously cited Scientific American article. Thus, McCain teaches the framework of applicants invention and the previous knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art provides the foundation and explains the inherent functions performed by McCain.

Applicants are uncertain as to which Scientific American article the Examiner is referring to. No such article was found listed on Form PTO-892, Paper 2, December 22, 1994 or Form PTO-892, Paper 8, January 23, 1996, which are believed to be the only lists of the Examiner's cited references on record in the present application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's kind assistance in providing Applicants either a copy of that Scientific Article, or a complete citation identifying the article. With respect to the Examiner's interpretation of the teachings of McCain et al., Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is mistaken.

LAW OFFICES OF
SUTTERVORN, MORDELL,
MCCORMACK, FRANKELSON
& PUELL LLP

35 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 101
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 433-9920
FAX (408) 433-7990

P:\DMH\9856\M-2508-1\0208426.WP

- 2 -

SER. NO. 08/300,500

The portion of McCain et al., i.e., at column 7, lines 30-33, does not support the Examiner's suggestion that McCain et al. teach that the mobile unit, rather than the host computer, provides a response to the operator's positional data input. The context of that portion of McCain et al. is clearly described by its heading "(8) Interactive operation between hand-held and host." (Column 6, line 56). In that context, McCain et al. teach that:

Interactive operation between the hand-held unit and a host computer occurs when the host computer occurs when the hand-held unit sends a command which initiates a cooperative program in the host computer. This program runs within the host computer but requests inputs from the hand-held unit and accepts input sent from this unit as data to be used in its program, using the wireless link. In this way the hand-held unit operates much like a portable terminal.

(McCain et al., at column 6, lines 57-64)

Turning to the portion the Examiner relied upon, Column 7, lines 30-33 of McCain et al. state, in its entirety:

... Programs which are beyond the capability of the terminal to execute may be run, by the terminal operator, while maintaining the menu driven interface and portability. The operator may thus maintain an ...

Thus, it is clear that McCain et al. teaches that, using a host computer, rather the hand-held unit ("terminal"), allows programs larger than can be executed in the hand-held unit be executed in the host computer, while as the menu driven user interface remains portable. However, McCain et al. do not here suggest or disclose that the hand-held unit, rather than the host computer, generates the visual response to the positional data input. In contrast, Claim 1 recites that a means for controlling in the mobile unit, and not in the host computer, provides first a visual response to an operator's positional data input, prior to receiving subsequently an image generated by the application program running on the host computer:

means for controlling operations of said graphical display subsystem, said

input subsystem and said wireless communication subsystem, said means for controlling (i) causing said wireless communication link to be created; (ii) causing an application program to be run on said host computer; (iii) receiving from said input subsystem said positional data, providing a response to said user in acknowledgment of said positional data, and transmitting over said wireless communication link said positional data to said application program; and (iv) receiving over said wireless communication link from said application program data representing said image, and causing said graphical display subsystem to display said image on said graphical display.

(emphasis added)

Such arrangement allows visual response to positional data be immediately provided to the user at the mobile unit, rather than after processing by the host computer over a slow wireless communication link. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over McCain et al.

With respect to Claims 6 and 11, the Examiner states:

8. The argument concerning claim 6 has been noted. The rejection of this claim is maintained because when the portable touch screen display sends the positional data over the wireless link to the host computer to be used by the program running on the host computer, a wireless receiver/transceiver at the host computer would receive the positional data. The wireless reception of the positional data by the host computer is the type of fundamental technical information that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention would know is necessary for the host computer and the portable touch screen display to perform their programmed functions. Furthermore one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to accomplish the wireless reception of the positional data from basic communication technology. A reference to show such a reception not unnecessary and is inherent to the reference itself. The reception of data necessary to perform programmed functions is described in the previously cited Scientific American article.

10. The argument concerning claim 11 has been noted. The rejection of this claim is maintained for the reasons given in support of the rejection of claim 6.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has overlooked important limitations of Claims 6 and 11. Claim 6

recites a hand-held unit that provides first a visual response to an operator's positional data input, prior to receiving subsequently image modification generated by the application program running on the host computer:

a hand-held interface device comprising (i) a display device; (ii) a position input device, said position input device receiving positional data representative of a current location of said position input device; (iii) a wireless receiver and transmitter circuit, said wireless receiver and transmitter circuit transmitting said positional data; and (iv) control means for providing an image on said display device; and


a host computer being coupled to (i) a wireless receiver and transmitter circuit for communicating with said hand held interface device, said wireless receiver and transmitter circuit of said host computer receiving said positional data; and (ii) means for modifying said image in accordance with said positional data.

(emphasis added)


Thus, for the reasons similarly stated above with respect to Claim 1, Claim 6 is patentable over McCain et al. Claim 11, which recites limitations similar to those of Claim 6 recited above, is likewise patentable over McCain et al.


For the reasons set forth above, Applicants believe that Claims 1-13 are allowable and thus respectfully request their allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at 408-453-9200.

Respectfully submitted,


Edward C. Kwok
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,938

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C., 20231, on February 18, 1997.


Date of Signature


Attorney for Applicant(s)